

Department of Economics Criteria for Retention, Promotion, and Tenure

The Department of Economics has adopted the standards and criteria set forth herein to govern the granting of retention, promotion, and tenure to its faculty members pursuant to all relevant RPT regulation and guidelines in the Policy and Procedures Manual of the University of Utah. Particular reference is made to PPM 9-5.2. RETENTION, PROMOTION, AND TENURE <http://www.admin.utah.edu/ppmanual/9/9-5-1.html>; and PPM 8-6 FACULTY RETENTION AND TENURE OF REGULAR FACULTY <http://www.admin.utah.edu/ppmanual/8/8-6-.html>; and PPM 8-12.4 CODE OF FACULTY RIGHTS AND RESPONSIBILITIES <http://www.admin.utah.edu/ppmanual/8/8-12-4.html>.

I. Policy Statement

The Department of Economics (the "Department") recognizes as its primary mission the tasks of research and teaching. The Department considers the discovery and transmission of knowledge to be of foremost consideration in decisions relating to faculty retention, promotion, and tenure. A secondary consideration, although an equally necessary mission, involves university, professional, and public service.

It is the Department's policy to demand demonstrable achievement in the areas of both research and teaching as an indispensable qualification for promotion and tenure. For the purpose of retention, a reasonable potential to demonstrate achievement in research and teaching needs to be evident. In addition, due recognition shall be accorded faculty members for the quality and extent of their university, professional, and public service and shall be taken into account in the evaluation made in the context of retention, promotion, and tenure.

II. Qualifications for Retention and Promotion

A. Retention of Assistant Professors

1. sufficient evidence, given the candidate's review year, that the candidate may meet the criteria for promotions by the end of the candidate's probation period.

B. Retention of Associate Professor without Tenure

1. sufficient evidence of progress toward meeting the requirements for tenure

C. Promotion to Associate Professor and/or Tenure

1. established record of productive scholarship consistent with the criteria for evaluation of research set forth herein, and evidence of future publication potential;
2. acknowledged record of teaching success consistent with the criteria for evaluation of teaching set forth herein;
3. adequate record of service consistent with the criteria for the evaluation of service set forth herein. This rank will not be awarded solely for, or in major consideration of, outstanding service;
4. in accord with PPM 8-6, the same standards apply regardless of the year of service at the University of Utah in which the candidate is evaluated, i.e. for tenure to be recommended prior to the final year of the probationary period, the evidence in the file must demonstrate that the candidate unequivocally meets the tenure standard.
5. in the event that a person is hired at or promoted to the rank of associate professor before achieving tenure, the subsequent conferral of tenure requires that the faculty member has provided convincing evidence that he or she will continue to achieve the standards expected of an associate professor and is likely to achieve the standards expected for promotion to the rank of professor

D. Promotion to Professor with Tenure

1. excellent research indicated by the criteria below and continued record of productive scholarship following last promotion at a level at least equal to the requirements at that promotion.
2. continued record of success in teaching;
3. established record of university, professional, and public service.
4. in the event that a person is hired at or promoted to the rank of professor before achieving tenure, the subsequent conferral of tenure requires that the faculty member has provided convincing evidence that he or she will continue to achieve the standards expected of a professor.

III. Criteria

The Department's criteria that pertain to the qualification of candidates for retention, promotion, and tenure at all levels are: research, teaching, and university, professional, and public service. Research and teaching are of primary importance in evaluating the actual and potential performance of a candidate. Service is of secondary importance, but adequate performance in this area is expected of all candidates. It should be clearly recognized, however, that outstanding performance of service will not suffice to compensate for poor performance in research and teaching.

The term "criteria" does not mean that each criterion need be equally important within a given area. The criteria are a guide to the faculty's overall judgment as to the performance of the candidate.

IV. Rationale

The rationale for the criteria of evaluation in each area is based partly on generally accepted practices in the economics profession and partly on the tradition and experience of the Department.

A. Criteria in the Area of Research

1. the Department of Economics recognizes three general criteria for evaluating the research activities of candidates for retention, promotion, and tenure. These criteria are: (1) quality, (2) quantity, and (3) continuity. The Department's unique role in the evaluation process is to assess research quality.
2. it is expected that candidates publish at least a core quantity of high quality research in outlets that require professional peer review. In addition, it is expected that candidates show a sustained effort in research. The Department's ultimate judgment of the candidate's research effort will consider the candidate's record taken as a whole.

Guides to Assessment

1. **Quality:** Any request for outside evaluations notwithstanding, the responsibility for assessing research quality rests with the Department. In its evaluation of research quality, the Department will consider at least the following non-prioritized factors:
 - i) evaluation and professional judgment by Department members with respect to professional impact, conceptual sophistication, internal consistency, and appropriateness of techniques;
 - (ii) evaluation by outside reviewers;
 - (iii) number of citations;
 - (iv) post-publication review of the candidate's books and mention in chapters or articles by peers;
 - (v) publications in outlets of known quality, including, but not limited to, *refereed* journals of high quality;
 - (vi) awards and honors.
2. **Quantity:** The types of published work considered in the Department's quantity assessment fall into two categories – primary and secondary. Co-authorship is not a factor in assessing quality or quantity of research. The Department shall assess which research outlets are most applicable to the candidate's research area. The primary categories of published work include:
 - (i) articles in journals;
 - (ii) books;
 - (iii) articles or chapters in books;
 - (iv) edited books;

The secondary categories of published work which will be considered:

- (i) popular press articles;
 - (ii) published reports or monographs;
 - (iii) unpublished reports or monographs;
 - (iv) conference papers;
 - (v) successful grant proposals;
 - (vi) unsuccessful grant proposals.
3. **Continuity:** The Department shall make a professional judgment in connection with the adequacy of the continuity of the candidate's research effort. Continuity refers to the candidate's sustained research effort over time. Continuity also can relate to the research effort itself, including topic areas, methodology, building on or broadening previous work, and other elements of coherence of the candidate's research program.

B. Criteria in the Area of Teaching

Teaching is an essential function of every faculty member of the Department of Economics. The evaluation of a candidate's success as a teacher will take account of the following factors: (1) conscientiousness and competence in conveying knowledge, (2) openness and receptivity to students and their ideas, (3) comprehensiveness in teaching and planning, (4) fairness as an evaluator of students, (5) willingness to take on new and special teaching arrangements and assignments, (6) innovative efforts in the areas of teaching techniques and in the development of new courses and curriculum design, (7) ability to generate student enthusiasm and interest in the subject matter, (8) interest in and utilization of scholarly activity in the classroom including: (a) knowledge of recent developments in the field, and (b) exploration of new areas of analysis in the classroom. The following is a non-exclusive and non-prioritized list of data that may be considered in evaluating and making a meaningful assessment of a candidate's teaching accomplishments; it, collectively, will be treated as a "teaching portfolio":

Guides to Assessment

1. Judgments of senior faculty based on personal observation of the candidate's teaching or its impact. Such judgments will be based on the eight criteria set forth above;
2. Classroom reviews by faculty members;
3. Student opinions as determined by:
 - a. systematic rating systems,
 - b. unsolicited past and present student letters;
4. Departmental analysis of course content through examination of course materials including, but not limited to syllabi, reading lists, lecture slides, choice of texts, assignments, exams, handouts and course websites;
5. Statement by the candidate regarding his/her teaching techniques, plans, philosophy, attempts at innovation and growth;
6. University or national recognition for teaching activities;
7. Demonstrated teaching products, e.g., experimental courses, various media techniques, student handouts;
8. Participation in University and community activities concerning teaching, e.g. committees, lectures on teaching, interdisciplinary teaching, and course development;
9. Supervised student research activities.
10. Report of the Graduate and Undergraduate SAC Committees.
11. Participation on dissertation and masters thesis committees.

The candidate's teaching portfolio should be as complete as feasible. However, at a minimum each teaching portfolio should contain: (i) past teaching evaluations, (ii) copies of course syllabi, (iii) a statement by the candidate containing teaching philosophy, participation on dissertation and masters thesis committees, and any other information that the candidate deems to be helpful to the committee in assessing teaching. Reports by the graduate and undergraduate SAC committees will be separately provided.

C. Criteria in the Area of University, Professional, and Public Service

Service to the Department, the University, and the larger community is an obligation of the public servant in an academic setting. The Department and University require the efforts of the faculty in its self-management activities, and it is recognized that faculty members of the Department often possess special skills, which are useful to the economy and to the community.

Guides to Assessment

1. Editorship of professional journals, acting as referee for professional journals and serving as an officer in professional associations;
2. Service on committees, task forces, and special assignments;
3. Committee chairperson;
4. Service as University representative to other universities and organizations;
5. Consultant activities in the community within the limits of university policy;
6. Participation in special community projects and studies;
7. Professionally related community positions, e.g., participation in educational groups, professional adviser to various groups, school board memberships, and public service agencies;
8. General community educational contributions: lectures, workshops, etc.

Service to organizations other than those reasonably related to a candidate's expertise should not be considered as community service. Specifically, religious and social activities will not be considered community service.

V. Procedures

The economics department's procedures for its faculty RPT process are set forth below. Alteration of those sections where department discretion exists under the PPM requires a vote of the RPT Committee, or when such a vote is not possible, the approval of the department chair will be sufficient. The department RPT Committee is constituted according to the university regulations and vote in accordance with those regulations. The RPT Committee is comprised of all tenured faculty. Lecturers and adjuncts are not part of the RPT Committee. The tenure track faculty will elect a chair and secretary of the RPT Committee each Fall semester.

Each untenured faculty member will have one mid-probationary retention review in the 3rd Year. The tenure and promotion review will normally occur in the 7th year. However, if the candidate is deemed not to be making sufficient progress, the RPT Committee will decide by majority vote whether to trigger a formal review earlier than the normal schedule.

Informal Review:

1. Informal reviews of untenured faculty will be conducted by the RPT Committee annually except in formal review years. In the case of a joint appointment, the file and recommendations from the program will be solicited and taken into account.
2. Informal reviews are initiated during the Spring semester prior to the academic year when the review will occur by the notification in writing by the department chair to the entire faculty.
3. The file prepared by the candidate must include an updated CV and a summary of teaching evaluations. The file will be submitted to the RPT Committee after the Fall semester of the review year in order for the RPT Committee to meet during the Spring semester.
4. Following the RPT Committee meeting, the chair (or a designee as per department guidelines) will meet face to face with the faculty member to be reviewed and discuss the candidate's progress based on the file.
5. Retention will be recommended if there is sufficient evidence, given the candidate's review year, that the candidate may meet the criteria for promotion by the end of the candidate's probation period. A written report will be prepared jointly by the RPT Committee and the Department Chair.

Formal Review for Retention, Tenure and Promotion:

A. Spring semester

1. All mandatory formal and informal reviews are initiated during the Spring semester prior to the academic year when the review will occur by the notification in writing by the department chair to the entire faculty. All formal and informal reviews will be conducted by the RPT Committee.
2. Faculty who seek to obtain voluntary review must notify the department chair if they wish to be reviewed for promotion or tenure at the latest thirty days after receiving the department chair's letter described in item above.
3. Other academic departments or programs are notified in cases of candidates with joint appointments.
4. Each candidate shall obtain a presenter and may suggest to the presenter a list of potential outside reviewers. The candidate determines whether to waive the right to review outside evaluations. Each formal review shall include three outside evaluations, except the 3rd year review which requires only two outside evaluations. The candidate can add up to three more outside reviewers.
5. The Department faculty meet to elect a chair and secretary. The RPT committee determines the outside reviewers that will evaluate the candidate. The RPT Committee is constituted according to University regulations and members may vote in accordance with those regulations. Lecturers and adjuncts are not part of the RPT Committee.
6. The candidate and presenter jointly prepare the candidate's file as it becomes available, which will include:
 - a) letter waiving or retaining the right to review external reviewer comments;
 - b) publications
 - c) road map of research;
 - d) current vitae;
 - e) summary of student evaluations;
 - f) teaching portfolio;
 - g) information from previous reviews as required by university regulations;
 - h) any other information relevant to the department's RPT criteria.
7. RPT Committee sends appropriate information to outside reviewers. This information will include, at minimum the candidate's vitae, roadmap, and publications selected by the RPT committee, in consultation with the candidate, as most appropriate for evaluation by each outside reviewer.

B. Fall Semester

1. Graduate and undergraduate SAC's meet and evaluate the candidate.
2. Complete file is transmitted to the RPT committee by the Presenter containing the materials noted above in A.6 and in addition:
 - a) SAC evaluations;
 - b) other program recommendations, if relevant;
 - c) outside review letters, including outside reviewers' qualifications, and whether the reviewer was selected by the RPT committee or the candidate;
3. RPT Committee meets and reviews the candidate's file. The RPT Committee votes on the retention and/or promotion and/or tenure of the candidate. The substance of the meeting, persons present, and results of the vote are summarized by the RPT secretary. The RPT Committee votes to approve the summary. The RPT chair and RPT secretary sign the summary of the minutes.
4. The candidate receives a copy of the summary and can respond within one week.
5. The summary and candidate's response, if any, are added to the candidate's file and transmitted to the department chair.
6. The department chair evaluates the candidate by letter.
7. The candidate receives a copy of the chair's letter and can respond within one week.
8. The chair's letter and candidate's response, if any, are added to the candidate's file and the file is transmitted to the Dean of the College by November 15.

VI. Burden of Proof

The candidate bears the full burden to provide the RPT Committee with the information necessary for a full evaluation of the research, teaching, and service activities listed on the candidate's curriculum vitae.

VII. Assessment of Criteria

Any ambiguity in connection with the meaning or intent of these criteria can only be resolved by a majority vote of the Department's cognizant RPT Committee. Any changes in the criteria themselves require a majority vote of the entire department with oversight from relevant university administrative organizations.